The Solicitors' Journal

and Weekly Reporter.

(*ESTABLISHED IN* 1857.)

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 1, 1917.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, WHICH MUST BE PAID IN ADVANCE:
£1 6s.; by Post, £1 8s.; Foreign, £1 10s. 4d.
HALF-YEARLY AND QUARTERLY SUBSCRIPTIONS IN PROPORTION.

*** The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.
All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

GENERAL HEADINGS.

Current Topics.

Sir Donald Maclean.

BOTH BRANCHES of the legal profession are gratified by the inclusion of Mr. MACLEAN among the Knights Commanders of the Order of the British Empire. A solicitor and a member of the House of Commons, the new Knight has served on the Home Office Advisory Committee which controls Internment Orders, and has acted for eighteen months as Chairman of the House of Commons Appeal Tribunal. In both capacities he has done excellent work; in the latter his dignity, courtesy, common sense, and fairness of mind have won for him golden opinions from all who practise before the Tribunal. Although nominally only one Appeal Tribunal among many, and not even entitled to rank as *primus inter pares*, yet in practice the House of Commons Tribunal has naturally attracted greater public interest than others, has had its decisions more widely reported, and has led its fellows on most points of policy. This has largely been due to the judicial instinct and knowledge of the world displayed by its Chairman. The hardships incident to compulsory military service are inevitably very great, especially in a country not prepared for them by previous experience, but to these inevitable grievances some tribunals have added a wholly unnecessary sense of injustice by adopting towards applicants a harsh and unsympathetic attitude. From this failing, alike of heart and good manners, the House of Commons Tribunal has been conspicuously free. The consideration and good nature with which he has discharged an unpleasant duty are not the least of Sir DONALD MACLEAN'S claims to his well-earned distinction.

Demobilized Lawyers.

THE NUMBER of baronets and solicitors released from further service as the result of wounds or ill-health seems to be steadily growing, if one may judge by the growing prevalence of the Silver Badge on the right breast lapel of the practitioners one meets in magisterial and county courts. When peace comes, it is obvious that the number of discharged or demobilized lawyers will be very great. It is to be hoped that some attempt will be made to unite in some permanent society those members of the legal profession in both its branches who have served together and suffered hardships together in the New Army. Of course, numerous associations are being formed everywhere which offer membership to ex-veterans of the war, but the size of these groups will be gigantic and their membership very composite. What is wanted is a special society for lawyers as a class; perhaps a club might be formed with premises in London at which country members could reside on their visits

to town. To the best of our belief there is at present no lawyers' club, and one composed of ex-service men would fill a recognized void. The question is one on which we would be interested to hear the opinions of our readers.

Imperial Judicial Appointments.

THERE IS another matter in which we think some action might well be taken in their own interests by demobilized lawyers. It is generally understood that vacancies of an administrative or judicial nature in the Colonial and Indian Services are not at present being filled except in cases of special urgency; the work of a vacant office is carried on with temporary help until the termination of the war. When war is over it is intended to recognize the superior claims of men who have served in the war by giving them a prior claim to any appointments for which they are deemed suitable. All fair-minded men will agree that this is equitable. Service men have borne special burdens which have not fallen on the shoulders of those whom age or special circumstances have retained in civilian life. Where the burden is imposed, there also privilege should be conferred. But we fear that, the moment war is over, all this will be forgotten. The claims of legal and academic distinction, of social influence, of political service, will begin to make themselves felt once more. The barrister or solicitor whose claim is based chiefly on his record of service in the Army or Navy will be pushed aside in favour of some "indispensable" who has served in a Whitehall office or some ardent politician who has party promises in his pocket. We venture to think that this is not right, and does not commend itself to the sense of equity in those who have not served, but who—when disregard of service claims becomes general—will feel that it would be quixotic to pass a self-denying ordinance against themselves. The only way to secure a fair consideration for their claims is for demobilized lawyers to unite in pressing them on the attention of those in power. The Lord Chancellor, the Law Officers, the Home, Colonial, and Indian Secretaries, should all be asked definitely to prepare lists of ex-service lawyers, from whom suitable candidates for all future legal vacancies will be selected unless the office is manifestly one for which no ex-service man is likely to be qualified.

Legal Reconstruction.

BUT WHEN this war at last has reached the victorious end which all patriots desire, there will begin another great task—that of Reconstruction at home. The air is filled with talk about agricultural reconstruction, industrial reconstruction, imperial reconstruction, religious reconstruction, political reconstruction. But we fancy that lawyers, too, will have to set their house in order. There is much in the old order which we all love and fain would preserve, but which is not likely to commend itself to the revolutionary spirit that is abroad. There are at least three problems which, we expect, will have to be taken in hand. The first is the question of County Court Reform. Just before the war it looked as if county court jurisdiction was going to be extended; but opposition from powerful interests seemed likely to block the way. We are largely in sympathy with the cautious conservatism which inspired that opposition. But we fear that, for good or for evil, its day is over. Public opinion, in a mood for change, will insist on the simplification of legal procedure and the cheapening of law. The line of least resistance here seems to be the expansion of the county court into the universal civil court of first instance—which is practically the position of the Scottish Sheriff Court. That court has first instance in almost all causes, except divorce suits, and its jurisdiction is co-ordinate with that exercised by the Outer House of the Court of Session, which corresponds with our Supreme Court of Judicature. The remodelled county court might be divided into three courts: a small debt court presided over by the registrar, an inferior court under the auspices of an assistant judge, and a superior court, which would try actions at present only competent in the High Court, in which the judge himself would sit. To this "Superior Court" would be transferred all the civil work of assizes and all the first instance work of the King's Bench Division, except that on the Crown side. In fact, the Common Law Division would become simply a Divisional Court to control the lesser courts. Or if this seems too revolutionary, then the first instance jurisdiction of the King's Bench Division might be retained, co-ordinate with that of the county court, and the struggle between the competing jurisdictions to get the larger work should be allowed full play; it would have a stimulating effect on efficiency.

Conveyancing Reform.

THE SECOND line of change which seems inevitable is some fundamental alteration in our system of conveyancing. Here many of us love the old ways best. We doubt the wisdom of changes, and their practical value, however unanswerable is the case for them on paper. But it is well to be prepared for the worst. And certain it is that our land laws are going to be overhauled when the war is over. There seem three rival alternatives. The first, and certainly the most moderate, is to revive the Conveyancing and Land Transfer Bills, which were under the consideration of Parliamentary Committees during the whole of the last *ante-bellum* year. The object of these Bills, our readers will recollect, was to simplify private conveyancing, not to supersede it by a public system, and to remove anomalies in the partial system of land registration which at present exists. In other words, their object was to give private conveyancing another chance of satisfying the public demand for cheaper and safer transfer of land. Their strictly moderate proposals, although anathema to the rigid conveyancer in Lincoln's Inn, met with the approval of the Law Society. That progressive and statesmanlike body recognized the necessity of some change, and felt that the revival of MR. WOLSTENHOLME'S proposals, which formed the basis of the Bills, was the most conservative way of facing a situation in which the policy of "standfast" had ceased to be practicable. The second alternative is more revolutionary; it is the scrapping of our conveyancing system altogether and the introduction of land registration, compulsory and universal, on Australian or Canadian lines. Still more revolutionary is the third alternative, which we have heard quite gravely and seriously proposed by ardent bureaucrats, namely, the transfer of all conveyancing as a State monopoly to the ever-growing department of the Public Trustee! As regards both these latter alternatives, we can only say *Absit omen!* But there are powerful influences abroad in the land which are working in their favour, not the least of which is a general distrust of lawyers, and a dread of their conservatism, skilfully fostered in certain sections of the public Press. The only way to counteract such insidious ideas is to meet them half way. Lawyers must get "their blow in first." They must face the necessity of legal reforms, face them honestly and resolutely, not half-heartedly, take the initiative in preparing schemes of change, and push for all it is worth the plan which commends itself to their riper experience.

A Civil Code.

THE THIRD great question which is bound to come up in the near future is that of a Civil Code. Hitherto the demand for a codification of our laws has been confined in England to academic doctrinaires or social extremists. The practical English nature, with its dislike of organization, has not taken kindly to the organization of juridical doctrines. But three years of war and concentrated bureaucracy are visibly working a great change. We feel reasonably certain that the question of a Civil Code will come up for Parliamentary decision in the early days of the first *post-bellum* House of Commons. All continental countries have their codes. Indeed, democracy and revolutionary sentiment naturally turn towards the codification of the law. The citizen of a democratic age feels that he wants to be able to find his law for himself. He does not like the necessity of going to a lawyer for it. It is not merely a question of money, the dislike to part with six-and-eightpence. It is largely a sense of weakness and inferiority; the layman feels that his ignorance of the law puts him, somehow or other, in the hands of the lawyers and at their mercy. And lawyers,

like clergymen, have ceased to be regarded with reverence as the privileged custodians of sacred mysteries with which the profane had better not meddle; rather both are regarded with distrust as the depositaries of outworn traditions. So the self-confident or conceited layman buys a popular book of law; and, of course, he gets badly hit when he proceeds to act on the half-truths it contains. All this makes for the demand that law should be codified. We believe that in the long run lawyers have nothing to lose by the codification of the law. They will still be required to interpret the code, advise on particular sets of facts, and act as advocates in the courts. There are no countries in the world where so many lawyers of all kinds flourish as in France, Spain, and the South American Republics, all of which have had a century of codes. Indeed, in England we have made a beginning. Many branches of criminal law (*e.g.*, Perjury, Forgery, and Larceny) have been consolidated, and a few branches of civil law, such as the Sale of Goods, Bills of Exchange, and Partnership, have been partially codified. Lord HALSBURY'S monumental Encyclopædia of the Laws of England is, indeed, a code drawn up by private enterprise, without the *inprimatur* of legislative or judicial recognition, and arranged—rather unfortunately—in alphabetical instead of logical order. Perhaps the task of providing relief work for demobilized lawyers may take the form of employment by the State on the drafting of a Civil Code!

Differential Treatment.

THE QUESTION as to what constitutes an "undue preference" of one consumer over another has come up again in *Attorney-General* v. *Hackney Met. Boro. Council* (1917, W. N. 264). Where a statutory undertaker, such as a railway, water, gas, or electric supply company, gets the *privilegium*, as Roman Jurists called it, of becoming sole dealers in a particular service, the Legislature justly and properly imposes on that privileged person the duty of treating all consumers equally. In the case of electric lighting, the operative statutory enactment consists of sections 19 and 20 of the Electric Lighting Act, 1882. Section 19 provides that every consumer is entitled to a supply of electricity on the same terms on which any other person is entitled "under similar circumstances" to "a corresponding supply"; and section 20 forbids "any undue preference" to any consumer. So far so good. But the principle thus laid down is not always easy to follow out in practice, and three successive cases have shewn that its application is rather more limited than one would at first imagine. The first is *Attorney-General for Victoria* v. *Melbourne Corporation* (1907, A. C. 469), where an Australian case under a similar enactment came before the Judicial Committee. There it was held that the undertaker may give the consumer his choice of two systems, either an *ad libitum* supply at a fixed rate or a varying supply at a rate proportionate to the amount consumed; this is not "differentiation" between one consumer and another, although one of the systems is in fact much cheaper to such few consumers as can avail themselves of it than is the other system to the great majority who cannot afford the fixed rate. Then in *Attorney-General* v. *Long Eaton U.D.C.* (1915, 1 Ch. 124), the Court of Appeal carried the doctrine a stage further. In that case factory owners who took light as well as power were charged less per unit of electricity than those who took power only; in effect, they got their power at a cheaper rate than the non-light consumers. This the Court of Appeal held to be equitable and *intra vires*, since the double user really means a diminution of cost to the undertakers in wires, meters, and installations. And now, in *Attorney-General* v. *Hackney Met. Boro. Council* (*supra*), ASTBURY, J., has approved as *intra vires* the defendant Corporation's provision of two scales, one for light and a lower one for power, with an arrangement allowing power-users to employ their electricity for light purposes subject to certain conditions as to quantity and user of wires or meters. In effect, this means that power-consumers get light more cheaply than non-power consumers; but the cost of double service in wires and meters is saved, and, in any case, the supply is not "a corresponding supply," or, "in similar circumstances," such as creates an undue preference.

Evidence of Hostile Origin.

NO MORE interesting case has been decided under recent emergency legislation than that of *Attorney-General* v. *Schamis* (*Times*, 4th July). The point in dispute was important as well as interesting; but the interest is increased by the unusual character of the procedure and the nature of the evidence relied on to support the case for the Crown. What happened was briefly this: The Post Office Censor Department opened a parcel sent by Mr. SCHAMIS (a Russian subject) in Holland by the Dutch mail to a London branch of the London and South Western Bank for Mr. WEINBAUM, who made no claim to the parcel and dropped out of the case altogether. The parcel contained six packets of diamonds, and the expert consulted by the Post Office was of opinion that these stones had been cut in Antwerp; also that they were of a kind found in the diamond mines of German South West Africa. These facts, if this inference were correct, were of importance. For at the date the parcel was sent, 8th July, 1915, the Germans were in occupation of Antwerp, and at the only date at which the stones could have been found—namely, prior to the war—they were also in possession of South West Africa, since wrested from them. But under section 1 of the Customs (War Powers) No. 2 Act and the Proclamation of 16th February, 1915, the Crown is entitled to seize goods of "hostile origin," and goods coming from places in the "occupation" of the enemy are declared to be of "hostile origin." So if the Crown could establish either that the diamonds came from South West Africa or that they had been cut in Antwerp they were entitled to seize the goods. Accordingly a Crown information was brought claiming the goods, and against this Mr. SCHAMIS appeared as claimant. The information was tried as a civil process before RIDLEY, J., and a special jury. Of course, the use of Crown informations to recover Crown property in the hands of a subject or Crown debts is the ordinary process, and its application to the case of a statutory right to seize forfeited goods is strictly logical; but the process is unfamiliar in such a case, and therefore has a somewhat archaic interest. But now the difficulty of the Crown arose. They had to furnish proof of origin either in Antwerp or in South West Africa, but could not trace the diamonds to either place. Their expert, however, gave evidence to show that the diamonds were of a kind and in a state which suggested that they must have been dug in South West Africa and cut in Antwerp. Then the Crown relied on the presumption that all diamonds found in Holland in July, 1915, and showing signs of recent cutting must have reached Holland *via* Antwerp, the only diamond-cutting centre in its vicinity, and could scarcely have any origin except a German one. The special jury found a verdict for the Crown, doubtless from a feeling that if the diamonds had a friendly or neutral origin the defence could easily have proved it. But how far the evidence offered—which only raised a case of suspicion—is really sufficient in law to create a presumption of hostile origin may remain a matter for reasonable doubt.

A Judgment Debtor's Travelling Expenses.

IT IS elementary law that the Crown writ of prohibition issues to stay the proceedings of any court or body exercising judicial authority which professes to act without jurisdiction, but is not available to correct a merely erroneous decision on a point of law: *Alderson* v. *Palliser* (1901, 2 K. B. 833). The proper remedy for the latter is by way of appeal or case stated, according to the forum, if indeed any remedy in the particular case happens to exist. Prerogative writs are issued not to correct mere errors of law, but to secure the performance of judicial duties and to prevent the assumption of *ultra vires* powers. But, like other elementary and sweeping rules of the common law, the application of this principle has become guided by technical rules, which are seldom very obvious *a priori*, and are often extremely subtle. This is illustrated

by the case of *Ward* v. *Nield*, a short note of which appears in the *Law Times*, p. 216. The simple question was whether a judgment debtor summoned for examination as to his means to a court outside the district where he resides is entitled to travelling expenses both ways, or only one way. Now at common law a witness is entitled to his expenses to and from the court: *Hallet* v. *Mears* (13 East 12); and by R.S.C., ord. 25, r. 31 (3), of the County Court Rules a summons to a judgment debtor is treated as a summons to a witness within section 111 of the County Court Act, 1888. It would seem clear, then, that a judgment debtor is entitled to travelling expenses both ways, but the wording of the rules on the point, ord. 25, r. 26, and ord. 53, r. 39, is a little ambiguous on the point. So a county court registrar on taxation, in giving the judgment debtor expenses, allowed only single fare—and as there is no appeal from the registrar's decision, the question arose how an obvious error could be set aside. A writ of prohibition suggested itself. But it is necessary to found such a writ on alleged assumption of a non-existent jurisdiction. And so it was alleged that the registrar had no jurisdiction to give the debtor expenses in a way which forced him to attend court without having any means of returning home. The Divisional Court accepted this view, and stayed all further proceedings on the summons.

Waiver of Objection.

THE DANGERS that arise out of the hasty initiation of proceedings against supposed absentees from military service are well illustrated by a case which came before Mr. CHANCELLOR at Old-street Police Court on Wednesday (*O. C. Wimbledon R. T. Battalion* v. *Hathersick*). The defendant, a rejected man, received the usual statutory order, under the Review of Exceptions Act, to attend for medical examination on 2nd June. At his own request and for reasons of convenience re-examination was postponed, but a subsequent notice to attend for re-examination on 15th June was alleged by the recruiting authorities to have been sent him. HATHERSICK denied on oath that he had ever received it. On 21st June he was posted to the Wimbledon Reserve Training Battalion, with instructions from Whitehall to report on 25th July. On 21st July he entered a claim for exemption with the Finsbury Tribunal, and duly informed his commanding officer. No objection to his entry of a claim, although out of time, since in the absence of leave extending the time his right to apply for exemption expired on the thirtieth day after the statutory notice, appears to have been taken by the military authorities, who sent him home pending the hearing of his appeal. But at the end of August the police arrested HATHERSICK as an absentee at the request of the O.C. Wimbledon R.T. Battalion. At the hearing Mr. CHANCELLOR took the view that the military authorities must be taken to have waived, by their acquiescence, any objection to the validity of HATHERSICK'S application for a certificate of exemption. That being so, he had a valid application pending before the tribunal, and, until it was disposed of finally, could not be an absentee. In dismissing the summons the learned magistrate seems to have commented on what he considered a high-handed attempt of the military authorities to override the local tribunals; but this strikes us as a quite unnecessary interpretation of the facts. Probably instructions to arrest HATHERSICK were issued as a matter of course, since no one of the various military authorities concerned would be fully acquainted with all the facts of the case.

Divorce of Enemy Spouses.

EVERYONE WILL sympathize with the hard position of English men and English women married to Germans and in consequence placed in a position of much distress and some obloquy at the hands of vulgar bigots. But the proposal to make the declaration of war with Germany a sufficient cause of divorce without any other matrimonial wrong cannot commend itself either to our sense of equity or our sense of expediency. Where a foreign-born spouse has performed faithfully his or her matrimonial duties the right of repudiation cannot be conferred on the English-born spouse without injustice as well as the violation of every religious principle. Again, to establish such a precedent in the case of Germans, Austrians, Bulgarians, and Turks is to initiate a novel rule of international law which cannot end there. No distinction could be drawn between one nationality and another, and the result would be that the mere declaration of war with any nation would give British-born persons a right to divorce a spouse of that nationality. Now it is only fourteen years since we nearly went to war with Russia over the Dogger Bank incident and the stoppage of our liners in the Red Sea, only twenty years since Fashoda nearly made war inevitable with France, only seventeen since, in fact, we were fighting our South African allies, BOTHA and SMUTS, and scarcely twenty-seven since our ultimatum to Venezuela only just missed leading to war with the United States. None can tell when we may again be at war with any of these Powers; only a daring prophet of peace will risk his reputation on a negative answer. A principle which allowed any international marriage to be dissolved when war breaks out between the country of the spouses would in time end all international marriages and put back the clock of progress.

Divorce in Germany.

AS A matter of fact, the position of English women married to German husbands is not so hopeless as the advocates of easy divorce are suggesting. An instructive letter to the *Times* (Wednesday, 29th), which comes from the pen of Mr. WYNDHAM BEWES, a member of the Bar, who is well known as the translator of about a dozen foreign codes and as an authority on foreign law, draws attention to the fact that under German law most of those wives can secure release in a very simple way at the termination of the war. Article 1567 of the German Civil Code grants divorce to either spouse when the other commits wilful desertion for one year. Those British-born wives of Germans who desire the dissolution of their marriage are not likely to resume cohabitation after the war, and the German husband is almost certain to seek the redress of divorce in his own courts. Thus the wife will be, in fact, released without any revolutionary alteration in our own marriage laws. The wife, of course, would prefer to be *divorcer* instead of *divorcée*: but that is a sentimental, not a substantial, claim.

Military Service Points.

IT IS some time since we have published an article dealing with the Military Service Acts, and indeed no new points of importance have arisen. As the result of the Military Service (Allied Powers Conventions) Act, the defence of foreign nationality is no longer available to an alien, the subject of an allied Power, with whom we have concluded a convention for mutual conscription, unless he has complied with the conditions for alternative service laid down in such convention. But with this exception there has been no legislative enactment or judicial pronouncement which affects seriously the fundamental principles as summarized in our series of articles and the supplementary article on the Review of Exceptions Act. But certain difficulties still seem to bother the average practitioner who has not had sufficient opportunities of familiarising himself with the Military Service Acts and the practice thereunder. It may be useful to touch briefly on a few of the most constantly occurring among these difficulties.

In the first place, we find that the precise effect of the Review of Exceptions Act is often overlooked. That statute imposes contingent liability to general service, from the date on which a statutory notice is served under it, upon officers and men who would have been so liable under the earlier Acts but for one of these reasons, either (1) discharge for disablement or ill-health, (2) rejection, (3) a certificate of unsuitability for foreign service in the case of home service Territorials. So far all is clear and is generally under-

stood. But there are a number of persons within these three categories who would have been liable under the Military Service Acts, and yet are not liable under the Review of Exceptions Act. In other words, there are "exceptions" to the review of exceptions. These "exceptions" (including one class not strictly excepted in law) are not by any means all excepted to the same extent or in the same way, and their respective positions require careful study. They consist of three different classes.

The first class includes men who are excepted under the statute *both from liability to further service and from liability to medical re-examination*. These consist of:—

(*a*) Men engaged in agriculture, certified by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (or the Scottish Board of Agriculture) to be work of national importance, who were so engaged on 31st March, 1917 (s 1 (1) proviso).

(*b*) Discharged men who have left the service on account of disablement resulting from wounds or poisonous gas received at the hands of the enemy, and so certified by the Army Council or Admiralty, or on account of nerve disease certified by a special medical board to be result of naval or military service in the present war (*ibidem*).

The following points should be noted:—

(1) In both these cases a man who receives the statutory notice is liable for service unless he has obtained the required certificate either of the Board of Agriculture, Special Medical Board, Army Council, or Admiralty, as the case may be. If a certificate is refused for any reason, and he is summoned as an absentee, he cannot put forward this ground of exception or call evidence to prove that in fact he has satisfied the conditions of the statutory exception. Possibly, however, he could issue a writ of *mandamus* against the proper authority for the issue of a certificate. The duty to grant such a certificate appears to be imperative, not discretionary, when the conditions are proved to be satisfied, and the Divisional Court might hold that the refusal of a certificate in face of clear evidence as to the facts was not a *bonâ-fide* exercise of its powers on the part of the Government department concerned. Of course, in practice, where a discharged man is entitled to such certificate, but nevertheless receives the statutory order to present himself for re-examination, he has only got to state the facts on the certificate at the back of the Order, in which case the facts will be investigated by the recruiting officer and the notice cancelled. Till the notice is cancelled, however, the recipient is theoretically bound to obey it. He should, therefore, call at the recruiting office and see that the notice is cancelled in his presence with the recruiting officer's stamp.

(2) The mere fact of being wounded, followed by discharge on some other ground—*e.g.*, defective eyesight or rheumatism—constitutes no title to exception; the disablement which occasioned the discharge must be the result of the wound.

(3) Provided the wound which is the cause of the disablement and consequent discharge occurred "in an engagement with or otherwise from the enemy," it is not necessary that it should have been received on foreign service. A wound from anti-aircraft shrapnel in an engagement with Zeppelins is sufficient, but not one arising out of mere gunnery practice at home or abroad.

(4) When the disablement which is the ground of discharge results from a wound or gas, apparently disablement in a previous war is quite sufficient to entitle the man so discharged to his Army Council certificate; but in the case of nerve disease the disablement must have occurred during the present war. This is an anomalous distinction, but the wording of proviso (*b*) in sub-section (1) of section 1 to the Review of Exceptions Act appears to create it.

The second class of excepted men consists of those who are *excepted from liability to military service under the new Act, but are, nevertheless, technically liable to medical re-examination on receipt of the statutory order*. This curious class arises in two ways:—

(1) Men who were of military age when the first two Military Service Acts were passed, but who attained the age of forty-one before the thirtieth day after the day on which the statutory order is served upon them (see Local Government Board circular to Tribunals, R. 127, and Army Council Instructions, No. 640 of 1917, paragraph 23). We discussed in a previous article the curious way in which the wording of the various Acts sets up this age limit, and need not discuss it again.

(2) Men recalled for re-examination, but granted a final discharge as being permanently and totally unfit for military service (section 1 (5)).

But although both of the above classes are not liable to military service, they are bound to present themselves for medical examination, under a penalty of five pounds or three months' imprisonment, on receipt of the statutory order (section 1 (3)). Of course, the re-examination is really futile, and in such cases no recruiting officer insists upon it. But to put himself right in the eyes of the law, the recipient of a notice should call at the recruiting office and get it "cancelled" with the office stamp.

Our third class consists of men who are not in fact excepted by the Act, but are being excused liability to service under Army Council instructions as the result of a Parliamentary pledge. This class consists of men who have served overseas in the course of the present war and who have been discharged on the ground of disablement or ill-health, however caused. Service in a former war or in Ireland during the present war is not deemed sufficient. Such men, in order to get legal protection, should take their statutory order to the recruiting officer and get it cancelled. The effect of this is that, since no notice under the Review of Exceptions Act has been sent them, they are still entitled to the benefit of the exception in their favour created by the first Military Service Act. We strongly advise all men who receive the statutory order, no matter what their ground of exception is, to take the notice to the recruiting officer and see that it is cancelled. If this is done their legal protection is complete. Unless this is done it is not complete. As papers sometimes get mislaid in recruiting offices, and as changes of staff are not infrequent, so that a successor cannot recognize the act of a predecessor for which he has no written evidence, it is always best—and fairer to the military authorities themselves—to take the trouble of securing documentary evidence, wherever possible, that the excepted person is not liable.

Another misunderstanding of the Review of Exceptions Act, which frequently occurs, concerns the position of so-called "rejected" men under that Act. It should be said at once that no man recalled by the service on him of a statutory order under the Act, and in fact liable to such service, can possibly become a "rejected man." For on the thirtieth day after receipt of the statutory order he is "deemed to be enlisted and transferred to the reserve"—in other words, he becomes a "statutory reservist," and therefore a soldier awaiting his call-up out of the reserve. Nothing which occurs at the medical examination can prevent him from automatically becoming a reservist on the said thirtieth day. But the medical examination may place him in one of three different positions.

(1) He may be *accepted*, and passed for service in some category or other.

(2) He may be rejected as unfit for service with the colours, in which case he is simply relegated to the reserve (R.R.). But in such case he cannot be re-examined, and presumably cannot be called up out of the reserve, until six months after the date of the previous notice (section 1 (5)).

(3) He may be rejected as totally and permanently disabled, in which case he is entitled to a final discharge from the reserve (*ibidem, proviso*). This discharge must operate from the day on which he is deemed to be enlisted, namely, the thirtieth day after the statutory order, and not from the date of the medical examination, if prior to such day, for no reservist can be discharged until enlisted.

There is one other point, not wholly connected with the

Review of Exceptions Act, on which we find many practitioners in a very pardonable state of doubt. We refer to the effect of attaining forty-one before actual call to the colours on a man's liability to serve. The whole position is very anomalous, and can best be summarized as follows:—

(1) Men who attain forty-one before the "appointed date" in their case, *i.e.*, the date at which they are deemed to be enlisted and transferred to the reserve, are excused from liability to service in every case—unattested men as the result of the wording of the statutes, attested men by the grace of the Army Council. The "appointed date" varies in different cases:—

(*a*) In the normal case of bachelors, the crucial date is 2nd March, 1916.

(*b*) In the normal case of married men, 26th June, 1916.

(*c*) In the case of men "rejected" on offer to enlist since 14th August, 1915, who subsequently received a statutory notice under the second Military Service Act, it is 1st October, 1916.

(*d*) In the case of men who come in under the Review of Exceptions Act, it is the thirtieth day after the sending of a statutory order to such man.

(*e*) In the case of men who have become "ordinarily resident" in Great Britain since the passing of the Military Service Acts (*e.g.*, Irishmen or Colonials coming to reside in England), it is the thirtieth day after such man becomes "ordinarily resident"—whenever that may be.

(*f*) In the case of a dismissed officer or a discharged man who leaves the service for other grounds than disablement or ill-health, it is the thirtieth day after he leaves the service (*Fraser* v. *Military Authorities*, 15 L. G. R. 508).

In all of the above cases a man who attains forty-one before the "appointed date" never enters the Army at all, and so is not liable for service.

(2) Men who attain forty-one after the appointed date as above defined, but before receiving a call-up notice, are in the reserve and liable to service, no matter what age they have attained on being called up. This is so even in the case of men who obtained a certificate of exemption before the "appointed date" in their case, and whose certificates did not expire until after they attained the age of forty-one: *Ridout* v. *Cope* (1917, W. N. 225). At first sight it might seem that, since these men were excepted temporarily from the operation of the Act while holding that certificate, they did not become members of the reserve at all until after they had attained forty-one, and therefore are not liable for the same reason as the six groups in our first class; but the Courts have decided against this view.

The Constitution of the German Empire.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S reply to the Pope raises a question of much interest to constitutional lawyers. He holds that it is impossible to negotiate with the present Government of Germany, which he regards as autocratic. It must be replaced, he says, by a democratic Government before the Allied Powers can place sufficient reliance on its Treaty pledges to enter into negotiations with it. This naturally leads a lawyer to ask himself the simple query: What changes must the German Empire make in its constitution in order to satisfy the President's test?

This involves a preliminary enquiry as to the precise nature of the German constitution. This is generally supposed in England, quite erroneously, to be that of an absolute monarchy—as was the constitution of Russia before the recent Revolution. The Reichstag is generally supposed to be a merely advisory body which possesses no real legislative powers. This, however, is an error. Theoretically, the Reichstag is not less powerful than the British Parliament, and the nominal powers of the Emperor are less than those of the King of England. The difference arises out of the conventions of the two constitutions, not the legal powers of Reichstag and Parliament respectively. It is not the practice of the German Reichstag to refuse supply except on condition that the Government is selected in accordance with the wishes of the majority of its members and out of their number. The British House of Commons, on the other hand, has for three centuries adopted this course, and for three centuries before that attempted it with more or less success. In this fact rests the chief difference between the two constitutions.

A word should be said here as to the history of the German Empire. The old empire of CHARLEMAGNE split up into several great kingdoms, four of which—the German, Burgundian, Lombard, and Italian—combined to form the Holy Roman Empire of the Middle Ages. France was excluded, although in 1515 CHARLES V. had as rivals for election to the German throne not only FRANCIS II., King of France, but also our own HENRY VIII. The Empire was elective. First of all a body of German princes, known as Electors, of whom three were ecclesiastical princes and four or five lay princes (the number varied from time to time) elected the Emperor-designate as "German King." He was crowned in that capacity at Aix-la-Chapelle. Then he was crowned Burgundian, Lombard, and Roman king at Arles, Milan, and Rome respectively. When he received the last-named crown at the hands of the Pope he became automatically "Holy Roman Emperor." But his only real powers lay in Germany itself, where he ruled with the aid of a federal Diet. Gradually the various tenants-in-chief of the Crown acquired independence, and the Emperor's rights grew shadowy. Since after 1400 the Hapsburg family, rulers of Austria, were usually elected Emperors, they confined their efforts to the task of ruling their own dominions. Germany fell into disunion, and in 1805 the Empire was dissolved by Napoleon. But after 1815 the German States united again as an alliance or confederacy of independent princes, with a common foreign policy. Their ruling body, the Diet, consisted of representatives of each prince, under the leadership of Austria. In 1866 Prussia expelled Austria and some South German States from the Confederacy, but gave it a new federal constitution on modern lines. In 1871 the South German States, all except Austria, rejoined the Confederation, which took the name of "German Empire," under the hegemony of Prussia.

The new constitution of 1871 combined two features, a democratic and a monarchical, in order to please both parties in Germany—the National Liberals, or patriotic party, and the Conservatives, the party of the Princes. It contained also a third feature, to suit the historical traditions of the Empire. The democratic feature was the "Reichstag," a House of Commons elected by universal suffrage of all male citizens, then the most democratic franchise in Europe. It has full legislative and financial powers, subject, however, to veto by the Upper House. That Upper House, or Bundesrath, was the second or monarchical feature. It is a Council of the Princes—*i.e.*, the monarchs of the twenty-nine separate States which form the federal Empire. Each sends an agreed number of representatives to the Bundesrath, which can veto all legislation, and in practice initiates all legislation. It is thus the most powerful body in Germany. The third, or historical Imperial factor, is the creation of an Emperor, no longer elective, but vested as an inheritance in the King of Prussia, who controls the army and appoints the Imperial Chancellor or supreme head of the executive, but has no veto on legislative acts of the Reichstag and the Bundesrath.

It will be seen, then, that the German constitution contains one very democratic feature, the Reichstag, and two conservative features, the Bundesrath and the hereditary Empire. How can the Empire be most easily converted into a democratic State? By two simple means: (1) The abolition of the Bundesrath, with its veto, and (2) the re-conversion of the

Emperor into an elective king chosen by the Reichstag from any one of the princes. A very small alteration of the Constitutional Laws of the Empire would effect this.

Correspondence.

Annuities and Estate Duty.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.*]

Sir,—The recent correspondence in your columns on the subject of estate duty on the cesser of annuities has been of interest to me in connection with a claim of duty now being made under similar circumstances to those mentioned by "Lincoln's Inn."

An annuity was directed to be paid to the testator's widow out of the income of the testator's residuary estate, and subject thereto the residue was disposed of to the son, who in course of time became the sole trustee.

In 1907 the trustee and residuary legatee appropriated certain securities to answer the annuity, and since then has paid over the income of those securities to the annuitant. The evidence of this is in an account book showing the dividends received and the payment thereof to the annuitant, and containing her receipt on each occasion.

In answer to the claim for estate duty I submitted that the appropriation by the residuary legatee and trustee of the specific securities with the approval of the annuitant constituted a settlement thereof upon himself subject to the life interest of the annuitant, and that consequently the fund was relieved from duty under section 15 (1) of The Finance Act, 1896, the death of the annuitant causing a reverter to the residuary legatee as the disponer in 1907.

The answer of the authorities is that only the person who created the annuity can be considered the settlor, and that the fund had not passed to the residuary legatee until the death of the annuitant.

It is clear that estate duty could be avoided by the annuitant aptly discharging the estate from the annuity and the residuary legatee re-settling a sufficient sum upon the annuitant for life with reversion to himself, and it may well be worth while to take this course, but the question is, whether a specific appropriation without more constitutes a re-settlement.

You may think that sufficient has been said on the subject in your columns; but, if so, I should be greatly obliged if you would enable me to communicate direct with "Lincoln's Inn," as I have got to the point where it is desirable to cite authority for the contention I have put forward to the Inland Revenue.

HERBERT DENISON.

10 and 11, East Parade, Leeds. Aug. 24.

[It may assist our correspondent's object if we insert his letter here for the information of "Lincoln's Inn" and others interested. —ED., *S.J.*]

An Epitome of Recent Decisions on the Workmen's Compensation Act.

By ARTHUR L. B. THESIGER, ESQ., Barrister-at-Law.

(Cases decided since the last Epitome, p. 542.)

(1.) DECISIONS ON THE WORDS "ACCIDENTS ARISING OUT OF, AND IN THE COURSE OF, THE EMPLOYMENT.

Dennis v. *A. J. White & Co.* (H.L.: Lord Finlay, C., Earl Loreburn, Lords Shaw, Parker and Parmoor, 24th April and 14th June, 1917).

FACTS.—A boy employed as a plumber's mate by a firm of builders was sent by them on business errands in London on a bicycle kept on the premises. He went on such errands on the average once a day, and on one occasion was run into by a motor-car in a busy thoroughfare and injured. The county court judge held that the boy was not specially exposed to street accidents by reason of his employment, and refused to award compensation. This decision was affirmed in the Court of Appeal by a majority.

DECISION.—The risk of collision was inherent in the nature of the employment, and therefore the accident arose out of the employment. It was immaterial that the risk was shared by all members of the public who used bicycles. Appeal allowed. (Case reported SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 23rd June, 1917, p. 558; *Times*, 15th June, 1917; *W. N.*, 23rd June, 1917, p. 203; *L. T.* newspaper, 23rd June, 1917, p. 127; *L. J.* newspaper, 30th June, 1917, p. 256.)

Wales v. *Lampton and Hetton Collieries (Limited)*, *No.* 2 (C.A.: Swinfen Eady, Bankes and Warrington, L.JJ., 9th July, 1917).

FACTS.—A collier was leaving his work about 5.30 a.m. on the 23rd December, 1916, across some railway lines on his employers' premises, when he slipped on a switch which was rendered slippery owing to a very severe frost and broke his arm. The way over the railway lines was the ordinary way for him to take. The county court judge held that, as the whole country was ice-bound at the time, the accident was the result of climatic conditions to which his employment did not specially expose him, and therefore did not arise out of the employment.

DECISION.—The collier by reason of his employment was compelled to be in that particular place on that frosty morning; the accident therefore arose out of the employment. (*From note taken in court.* Case reported SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 14th July, 1917, p. 611; *L. J.* newspaper, 21st July, 1917, p. 284; *L. T.* newspaper, 21st July, 1917, p. 195; *W. N.*, 28th July, 1917, p. 250.)

Spencer v. *Owners of S.S. Liberty* (C.A.: Swinfen Eady, Bankes and Warrington, L.JJ., 9th and 10th July, 1917).

FACTS.—A fireman, whose ship was in dock, went ashore to see some friends. After seeing his friends he met two men, with whom he spent some time. They started to go to the docks, and when nearly there he left them, saying he was not going aboard at present. He was never seen alive again, but two months later his body was found in the dock where the ship had been moored. The county court judge made an award in favour of the widow.

DECISION.—The applicant had failed to prove that the accident arose out of and in the course of the employment, and there was no evidence to support the judge's finding. (*From note taken in court.* Case reported SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 28th July, 1917, p. 645; *L. J.* newspaper, 21st July, 1917, p. 285; *L. T.* newspaper, 28th July, 1917, p. 213.)

(*To be continued.*)

New Orders, &c.

War Orders and Proclamations, &c.

The *London Gazette* of 24th August contains the following:—

1. A Proclamation, dated 22nd August, under section 43 of the Customs Consolidation Act, 1876.

2. An Order in Council, dated 22nd August (printed below), amending the Defence of the Realm Regulations.

3. An Order in Council, dated 22nd August (printed below), amending the Aliens Restriction (Consolidation) Order, 1916.

4. An Order in Council, dated 22nd August, made in pursuance of the Military Service (Conventions with Allied States) Act, 1917.

5. An Order in Council, dated 22nd August, dissolving the War Pensions Statutory Committee, by virtue of the Naval and Military War Pensions, &c. (Transfer of Powers), Act, 1917.

6. An Order in Council, dated 22nd August, made under the Suspensory Act, 1914, continuing the suspension of the Government of Ireland Act, 1914.

7. An Order in Council, dated 22nd August, revoking a previous Order of 11th June, 1910, made under section 33 of the Explosives Act, 1875, exempting Tri-nitro-toluol from certain provisions of the said Act.

8. An Order in Council, dated 22nd August, made under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, making certain provisions as to the validity in the United Kingdom of Passenger Steamers' Certificates granted in Bombay and Bengal.

9. An Order in Council, dated 22nd August, extending to the Isle of Man certain Defence of the Realm Regulations not previously extended thereto.

10. An Order of the Minister of Munitions, dated 24th August (printed below), applying Regulation 30A to Tinplates and Terneplates.

11. A General Order of the Local Government Board, dated 22nd August, and styled the Local Authorities (Food Control) Order (No. 2), 1917.

12. A Notice issued by the Minister of Food, dated 23rd August, 1917, calling attention to the issue of the Grain (Prices) Order, 14th August, 1917, No. 820; the Barley (Restriction) Order, 15th August, 1917, No. 821; and the Peas, Beans, and Pulse (Retail Prices) Order, 14th August, 1917, No. 823. The first two were printed in this journal, *ante*, p. 698; the last named is printed below.

The *London Gazette* for Tuesday, 28th August, contains the following Orders, Proclamations, &c. :—

13. A Proclamation, dated 28th August, issued under section 8 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1879, and section 2 of the Customs (Exportation Prohibition) Act, 1914, amending a Proclamation issued 10th May, 1917, under section 1 of the Exportation of Arms Act, 1900.

14. A Foreign Office Notice, dated 28th August, correcting lists of persons and bodies in China to whom articles exported to that country may be consigned.

15. An Order of the Minister of Munitions, dated 25th August, taking possession of flax grown in the United Kingdom (printed below).

16. An Order of the Minister of Munitions, dated 25th August, restricting the manufacture of wet spun yarn made of flax line (printed below).

17. An Order of the Minister of Munitions, dated 28th August, including steel scrap among war materials to which Regulation 30A of the Defence of the Realm Regulations applies (printed below).

18. A Notice of the Minister of Munitions, dated 28th August, amending terms of General Permit as regards dealings in certain Steel Scrap.

19. A similar Notice of even date concerning Wrought Iron Scrap.

20. An Admiralty Order, dated 28th August, controlling stocks of yarn.

21. An Admiralty Notice to Mariners, No. 858 of the year 1917, regulating pilotage fees for the Firth of Tay.

New Defence of the Realm Regulations.

ORDER IN COUNCIL.

Whereas by an Order in Council, dated the twenty-eighth day of November, nineteen hundred and fourteen, His Majesty was pleased to make regulations (called the "Defence of the Realm Regulations") under the Defence of the Realm Consolidation Act, 1914, for securing the public safety and the defence of the realm :

And whereas the said Act has been amended by the Defence of the Realm (Amendment) Act, 1915, the Defence of the Realm (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1915, and the Munitions of War Act, 1915, and other enactments :

And whereas the said regulations have been amended by various subsequent Orders in Council :

And whereas it is expedient further to amend the said regulations in manner hereinafter appearing :

Now, therefore, His Majesty is pleased, by and with the advice of His Privy Council, to order, and it is hereby ordered, that the following amendments be made in the said regulations :—

1. Regulation 2C shall be amended as follows :—

(1) After the words "the Army Council" the words "or the Board of Trade" shall be inserted.

(2) After paragraph (*c*) the following new paragraph shall be inserted :—

"Where any trees, whether standing, felled or converted, possession of which has been so taken, are acquired by the Army Council or the Board of Trade, or any person duly authorized by them, the price to be paid in respect thereof shall, in default of agreement, be determined in the manner and in accordance with the principles prescribed by Regulation 2B."

2. At the end of sub-section (1) of Regulation 2J the following words shall be inserted :—

"and the Food Controller may by order provide for the exercise and performance by local bodies constituted by or under any such order of such powers and duties as may be conferred or imposed on them by the order."

3. Regulation 2JJ shall be amended as follows :—

(1) After sub-section (2) the following new paragraphs shall be inserted :—

"(3) The Board of Trade, and any person authorized by them, shall, as respects trees and timber, whether standing, felled or converted, and articles manufactured therefrom, have the like powers as are given to the Army Council under Regulations 2E and 15C, and those regulations shall apply accordingly.

"(4) Any order made by the Army Council under Regulations 2B, 2E, or 15C before the 22nd day of August, 1917, and in force on that date, affecting any such trees or timber as aforesaid, or articles manufactured therefrom, shall continue in force and have effect as if it had been made by the Board of Trade or a person authorized by them under this regulation, and as if the Board of Trade was substituted therein for the Army Council, without prejudice, however, to any action taken thereunder by the Army Council before that date."

4. At the end of sub-section (5) of Regulation 9GG the following words shall be inserted :—

"and the Army Council shall, as respects road materials, have the like powers as are exercisable under Regulation 2JJ by the Board of Trade as respects articles of commerce."

5. After Regulation 7B the following regulation shall be inserted :—

"7BB. Where it appears to the Board of Trade that it is necessary, for the purpose of maintaining an efficient service and promoting the efficient transport of goods with a view to the successful prosecution of the war, that any charges for carrying merchandise by sea between Great Britain and Ireland by a carrier whose power of charge is limited by law should be increased, the Board may by order, notwithstanding anything in any Act prohibiting such increase, authorize an increase, not exceeding such amount as the Board from time to time think necessary in the circumstances, and subject to such conditions as may be specified in the order."

6. At the end of paragraph (*d*) of Regulation 27 there shall be inserted the words "or to prejudice the success of any financial measures taken or arrangements made by His Majesty's Government with a view to the prosecution of the war."

7. For Regulation 31 the following regulation shall be substituted :—

"31. No person shall bring into the United Kingdom or remove from or to Great Britain to or from Ireland any firearms, parts of firearms, military arms, parts of military arms, or ammunition or any explosive substance without a permit from the competent naval or military authority, and if any person does so he shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations, and any person who has in his possession or custody or under his control any article so brought or removed in contravention of this regulation shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations, unless he proves that he did not know, and could not with reasonable diligence have ascertained, that the article was so brought or removed in contravention of this regulation.

"For the purpose of the enforcement of this provision the powers of search and seizure conferred by Regulation 51 shall be exercisable by officers of Customs and Excise as well as by the authorities, officers and persons mentioned in that regulation."

8. After Regulation 42A the following regulation shall be inserted :—

"42AA. If any person within any area in respect of which the operation of section one of the Defence of the Realm (Amendment) Act, 1915, is for the time being suspended procures or persuades a soldier to desert or absent himself without leave, or knowingly aids or assists a soldier about to desert or absent himself without leave, or knowingly conceals a deserter or absentee without leave, or aids or assists him in concealing himself, or aids or assists in his rescue, that person shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations, and for the purpose of this provision shall be deemed to have had knowledge unless he proves that he had not knowledge.

"If any person within any such area as aforesaid—

(*a*) buys, exchanges, takes in pawn, detains or receives from an officer or soldier or any other person; or

(*b*) solicits or entices an officer or soldier to sell, exchange, pawn or give away; or

(*c*) assists or acts for an officer or soldier in selling, exchanging, pawning or making away with

any arms, ammunition, equipment or clothing of an officer or soldier, that person shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations, unless he proves either that he acted in ignorance of the same being the arms, ammunition, equipment or clothing of an officer or soldier, or that the same was sold, by order or under the authority of the Army Council."

9. After Regulation 55A the following regulation shall be inserted :—

"55B. (1) Where a Secretary of State is satisfied as respects any area that it is expedient for the better protection of that area from fire that, in case of an air raid or apprehended air raid, the fire brigades and fire appliances in that area, or any of them, should be employed under single control, he may by order—

(*a*) constitute the area a special fire brigade area and define the limits thereof;

(*b*) provide that, in case of an air raid or apprehended air raid, the fire brigades in the special area or any of them, shall co-operate in accordance with a scheme approved by him, and shall, for the purpose of carrying out such scheme, act under the directions of a single authority, being the Chief Officer

of one of the Fire Brigades in the special area, or such other person or authority as may be specified in the order;

(c) make such additional and supplemental provisions as appear to him to be necessary for the purpose of giving full effect to the order;

and a Secretary of State may also from time to time give such directions as appear to him expedient for the purpose of giving full effect to the order.

"(2) All officers and members of fire brigades in the area to which the order applies shall comply with the directions of the Secretary of State, and with the directions of the authority specified in the order.

"(3) The powers conferred by this regulation on a Secretary of State shall, as respects any area situated in Scotland, be exercised by the Secretary for Scotland."

ALMERIC FITZROY.

New Aliens Restriction Order.

Whereas by the Aliens Restriction (Consolidation) Order, 1916 (hereinafter referred to as "the principal Order"), His Majesty, in exercise of the powers conferred by the Aliens Restriction Act, 1914, has been pleased to impose restrictions on aliens, and to make various regulations for carrying these restrictions into effect:

And whereas the principal Order has been extended and amended by subsequent Orders in Council, and it is expedient further to amend the provisions of the principal Order in manner hereinafter appearing:

Now, therefore, His Majesty is pleased, by and with the advice of His Privy Council, to order, and it is hereby ordered, that the following amendments be made in the principal Order:—

1. At the end of Article 22A the following sub-sections shall be added:—

"(10) Any powers conferred by virtue of this Article on the Minister of Munitions may be exercised on behalf of the Minister by any person or persons deputed by the Minister for the purpose.

"(11) Where it appears to a Secretary of State, on the recommendation of the Admiralty or Army Council, that it is necessary or expedient so to do with a view to the safety of the Realm, he may by Order direct that all or any of the provisions of this Article shall apply to work of any class or description specified in the Order as they apply to munitions work, and any provisions so applied shall thereupon have effect as if references to munitions work included references to work of any class or description so specified, and any such Order may provide for such modification of any provisions so applied as may appear necessary in order to make this Article applicable to the work in question, and in particular for the substitution as respects such work of some other Government Department for the Minister of Munitions.

2. Article 25 shall be amended as follows:—

In the paragraphs numbered (a), (b) and (c) after the word "are" wherever that word occurs there shall be inserted the words "or have recently been"; and for the words "shall be kept closed either altogether or" there shall be substituted the words "shall be either closed altogether or kept closed."

3. The following Article shall be inserted after Article 25B:—

"25C. A Secretary of State may grant, in such form and subject to such conditions as he may think fit, to any alien who, being a married woman or a widow, was before her marriage a natural born British Subject, a certificate of exemption from all or any of the provisions of this Part of this Order."

4. The following Article shall be inserted after Article 27B:—

"27C. Where any offence under this Order, or any Order revoked by this Order, consists of failure to comply with any of the provisions of this Order requiring any particulars to be furnished, or any report or return to be made, or any notice to be given, the offence shall, for the purposes of this Order, be deemed to have continued so long as such failure continues, whether or not any time is specified at or within which the particulars, report, return, or statement are to be furnished, made, or given."

5. The following sub-section shall be substituted for sub-section (1) of Article 34:—

"(1) This Order may be cited as the Aliens Restriction Order."

6. The following Article shall be inserted after Article 35:—

"36. The fact that any Article or any provision contained in any Article of this Order is, or has been, revoked or superseded shall not affect, and shall be deemed not to have affected, the previous operation of the Article or provision so revoked or superseded, or the validity of any action taken under any such Article or provision, or any penalty or punishment incurred in respect of any contravention or failure to comply with any such Article or provision, or any proceeding or remedy in respect of any such penalty or punishment."

ALMERIC FITZROY.

Order of the Minister of Munitions applying Regulation 30a to Tinplates and Terneplates.

In pursuance of the powers conferred upon him by Regulation 30A of the Defence of the Realm Regulations, the Minister of Munitions hereby orders that as from the 19th day of July, 1917, the war material to which that regulation applies shall include war material of the following classes, that is to say:—

Tinplates.
Terneplates.

The Peas, Beans and Pulse (Retail Prices) Order, 1917.

GENERAL LICENCE.

The Food Controller hereby authorizes, until further notice, the sale and purchase by retail in packages of peas to which the above Order applies, subject to the following conditions:—

1. The package may contain only peas and a bag of cooking requisites, and no packets shall be sold except packets of the approximate gross weight of 1 lb., ¾ lb., or ½ lb.

2. There shall be plainly printed on the outside of the package the name of the person by or for whom it was packed, the month in which it was packed, the gross weight of the packet and the net weight of the peas.

3. A 1 lb. (gross weight) packet may be sold at a price not exceeding 9d., provided that the net weight of the peas is not less than 14½ ozs.

4. A ¾ lb. (gross weight) packet may be sold at a price not exceeding 6¾d., provided that the net weight of the peas is not less than 10¾ ozs.

5. A ½ lb. (gross weight) packet may be sold at a price not exceeding 4½d., provided that the net weight of the peas is not less than 6¾ ozs.

By Order of the Food Controller,
U. F. WINTOUR,
Secretary to the Ministry of Food.

14th August, 1917.

Order taking Possession of Flax Grown in the United Kingdom.

Ministry of Munitions of War,
25th August, 1917.

The Minister of Munitions, in exercise of the powers conferred upon

him by the Defence of the Realm Regulations and all other powers thereunto enabling him, hereby gives notice and orders as follows :—

1. He hereby takes possession as from the date hereof of :—

(*a*) All flax of the 1917 crop grown in the United Kingdom as and when harvested.

(*b*) All flax grown in the United Kingdom at any time and not at the date hereof in the possession of a flax spinner for the purpose of his business.

(*c*) All other flax, except Russian Flax, now or hereafter situated in the United Kingdom.

2. The flax, of which possession is hereby taken under paragraph 1 (*a*) and (*b*), will be divided under the directions of the Controller of Aeronautical Supplies into six grades, according to its quality, handling and cleaning, and the Minister will pay the following prices therefor :—

Special grade, 35s. per stone, delivered at the appointed centre.
1st grade, 32s. 6d. per stone, delivered at the appointed centre.
2nd grade, 30s. per stone, delivered at the appointed centre.
3rd grade, 27s. 6d. per stone, delivered at the appointed centre.
4th grade, 26s. 3d. per stone, delivered at the appointed centre.
5th grade, 25s. per stone, delivered at the appointed centre.

Flax which is inferior in quality to that of the 5th grade hereinbefore mentioned will be paid for upon terms which will be subsequently communicated to the various owners.

3. If after this notice and order any person having control of any flax of which the Minister has taken possession hereunder sells, removes or secretes such flax without the consent of the Minister, he will be guilty of an offence against the Defence of the Realm Regulations.

4. No person shall as from the date hereof until further notice purchase, sell, offer to purchase or sell or, except for the purpose of carrying out a contract in writing existing prior to the date hereof for the purchase of such Flax, enter into any transaction or negotiation in relation to the sale or purchase of any Flax situated outside the United Kingdom.

5. Further directions with regard to the delivery of flax of which possession is taken hereunder will shortly be issued on behalf of the Minister by the Controller of Aeronautical Supplies.

6. All communications upon the subject of this notice and order should be for the present addressed to the Controller of Aeronautical Supplies and marked Flax Supplies, Dept. S. (M.A.) 1, Air Board Office, Strand, London, W.C. 2.

Order as to Wet Spun Yarn made of Flax Line.

Ministry of Munitions of War,
25th August, 1917.

The Minister of Munitions, in exercise of the powers conferred upon him by the Defence of the Realm Regulations and all other powers thereunto enabling him, hereby orders as follows :—

(1) No person shall on or after the first day of September, 1917, until further notice spin or manufacture any wet spun yarn made of flax line except under and in accordance with the terms of a licence issued under the authority of the Minister of Munitions.

(2) No person shall as from the date hereof until further notice purchase or take delivery of any wet spun yarn made of flax line except under and in accordance with the terms of a licence issued under the authority of the Minister of Munitions, or sell, supply or deliver any such wet spun yarn to any person other than the holder of such a licence as last aforesaid.

(3) All applications for a licence in connection with this Order shall be addressed to the Controller of Aeronautical Supplies, Department S. (M.A.)1, Air Board Office, Strand, London, W.C. 2.

Order of the Minister of Munitions as to Steel Scrap.

Ministry of Munitions of War,
28th August, 1917.

The Minister of Munitions hereby cancels the Orders made by him in exercise of the power conferred upon him by Regulation 30A of the Defence of the Realm Regulations, and dated the 31st October, 1916, and the 1st January, 1917, respectively, in so far only as the same relate to Steel Scrap, and hereby, in further exercise of the said power, orders that the war material to which that Regulation applies shall include war material of the following class, that is to say :—Steel Scrap of all classes and descriptions.

Ministry of Food Orders.

THE TEA (RETURNS) ORDER, 1917, DATED 20TH AUGUST, 1917, MADE BY THE FOOD CONTROLLER UNDER THE DEFENCE OF THE REALM REGULATIONS.

In exercise of the powers conferred upon him by the Defence of the Realm Regulations and of all other powers enabling him in that behalf, the Food Controller hereby orders as follows :—

1. All persons engaged in the purchase, sale or distribution of any tea, shall on or before the 10th September, 1917, furnish to the Food Controller a return giving particulars of tea (whether in bond or not) in his possession or under his control on the 3rd September, 1917, and such other particulars as may be required to complete the prescribed form of return.

2. The return shall be made on forms prescribed by the Food Controller to be obtained from and when completed to be returned to the Secretary of the Ministry of Food, Grosvenor House, London, W. 1. A copy of the form of return is set out at the foot of this Order.

3. A person who does not own or have power to sell or dispose of more than 500 lbs. of tea on the 3rd September, 1917, or who holds tea merely as a storekeeper for other persons shall not be required to make any return under this Order.

4. Failure to make a return or the making of a false return is a summary offence against the Defence of the Realm Regulations.

5. This Order may be cited as the Tea (Returns) Order, 1917.

By order of the Food Controller,
U. F. WINTOUR,
Secretary to the Ministry of Food.

20th August, 1917.

DEFENCE OF THE REALM.

MINISTRY OF FOOD.

TEA (RETURNS) ORDER, 1917.

RETURN OF TEA STOCKS

Held by .....

Of .....

On September 3rd, 1917.

Stock (*see* Note below).	China Tea. (lbs.)	Other Descriptions. (lbs.)	Total. (lbs.)
(A) Bonded Stock, in Public and Private Bond at			
(B) Duty Paid Stock, blended or otherwise			
Totals			

NOTE.—Tea bought or agreed to be bought although not delivered is to be included by the buyer in his return, wherever lying. Sellers are not to include tea sold or agreed to be sold.

This return must include all tea of every description, including in the case of traders all stocks at branches whether they are wholesale distributing branches or retail shops.

Certificate.

We hereby certify that to the best of our knowledge and belief the above is a true and correct statement of the whole of our stock of Tea on 3rd September, 1917, and that our average weekly sale for the normal purposes of our business at the present time is ..... lbs.

Date ..... 1917.

Signature .....

THE APRICOT PULP AND BITTER ORANGES ORDER, 1917, DATED 21ST AUGUST, 1917, MADE BY THE FOOD CONTROLLER UNDER REGULATION 2r OF THE DEFENCE OF THE REALM REGULATIONS.

In exercise of the powers conferred upon him by Regulation 2r of the Defence of the Realm Regulations and of all other powers enabling him in that behalf, the Food Controller hereby orders as follows :—

1. Except under the authority of the Food Controller no person shall on or after the 28th August, 1917, either on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person—

(*a*) Buy, sell, or deal in; or

(*b*) Offer or invite an offer or propose to buy, sell, or deal in; or

(*c*) Enter into negotiations for the sale or purchase or other dealing in;

any Apricot Pulp or Bitter or Sour Oranges or Pulp made from such oranges outside the United Kingdom, whether or not the sale or purchase or dealing is or is to be effected in the United Kingdom.

Provided that all persons are authorized to buy, sell and deal in Apricot Pulp and Bitter or Sour Oranges and Pulp made from such Oranges on passage to the United Kingdom at the date of this Order.

2. All persons concerned shall before the 28th August, 1917, furnish to the Secretary of the Ministry of Food, Grosvenor House, Upper Grosvenor Street, W. 1, a statement showing the quantity of Apricot

Pulp and Bitter or Sour Oranges and Pulp made from such Oranges purchased but not shipped at the date of this Order and the quantity thereof sold or unsold.

3. This Order shall not be construed as prohibiting the insurance of Apricot Pulp or Bitter or Sour Oranges or Pulp made from such Oranges.

4. Infringements of this Order are summary offences against the Defence of the Realm Regulations.

5. This Order may be cited as the Apricot Pulp and Bitter Oranges Order, 1917.

By order of the Food Controller,
U. F. WINTOUR,
Secretary to the Ministry of Food.

21st August, 1917.

Societies.

Belgian Lawyers Relief Fund.

The following further donations are gratefully acknowledged :—

Amount previously notified	£891	12	6
L. Monk Smith, Esq.	3	3	0
Sussex Law Society (*third donation*)	3	3	0
The Hon. Sir Arthur Peterson (*second donation*) ...	3	0	0
Alex. Fraser, Esq. (*second donation*)	1	1	0
William Trenholme, Esq. (*second donation*)	1	1	0
Herbert J. Holme, Esq. (*third donation*)	1	1	0
H. P. Venn, Esq. (*third donation*)	1	1	0
	£905	2	6

Further donations are still urgently needed, and should be sent to the Belgian Lawyers Aid Committee, General Buildings, Aldwych.

Obituary.

Qui ante diem periit,
Sed miles, sed pro patria.

Captain John Archibald Cahill, M.C.

Captain JOHN ARCHIBALD CAHILL, M.C., Royal Berkshire Regiment, killed on 16th August, the son of Dr. and Mrs. J. Cahill, of 12, Seville-street, London, S.W., was born in February, 1890. He was educated at St. Anthony's Preparatory School, Eastbourne, and at Epsom College, which he left, after passing the London Matriculation in 1906, to take up the study of law, being admitted a solicitor in 1912. He was in the Cadet Corps at Epsom, and joined the Artists Rifles in January, 1907, before they became a unit in the Territorial scheme, and he frequently represented the corps in Territorial and Army fencing competitions. At the outbreak of war he volunteered at once for general service, and went to the front in October, 1914. He received his commission as second lieutenant in February, 1915, was posted to a battalion of the Royal Berkshire Regiment, and was severely wounded in the following month. He was promoted to lieutenant in October, 1915, and captain in February, 1916, and was again wounded on 1st July of that year. In March of this year he was recommended for the Military Cross, the service for which he was decorated being thus described in the *Gazette:* "He took command of his company and successfully repelled a strong enemy counter-attack. He set a magnificent example to his men."

Captain Hubert O'Connor, M.C.

Captain HUBERT O'CONNOR, M.C., Shropshire L.I., eldest son of Mr. Charles O'Connor, F.R.C.S.I., and Mrs. O'Connor, of The Grove, Celbridge, Co. Kildare, was wounded at the head of his company on 16th August, and died of his wounds in hospital on the following day, aged thirty. Before the war Captain O'Connor was a well-known member of the Irish Bar. He was educated at Clongowes Wood, the Irish Jesuit College, and at Trinity College, Dublin, where he took his degree. In 1910 he contested East Limerick as an Independent Nationalist in the interests of Mr. William O'Brien. At the outbreak of the war he joined the Trinity College O.T.C., and obtained his commission in the K.S.L.I. in 1915. On 28th June, 1916, he was awarded the M.C. for conspicuous bravery in the field, going out three times under heavy shell fire to arrange for the carrying in of his wounded. He took a special course of training for senior officers at Aldershot last April, and returned to his regiment on 1st July.

Captain Gerald R. H. Knight.

Captain GERALD R. H. KNIGHT, Essex Regiment, attached Oxford. and Bucks. L.I., who died on 17th August of wounds received the previous day, was the younger and only surviving son of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Knight, of 17, Sydney-road, Richmond, S.W. Born in 1894, he was educated at St. Catherine's College, Richmond, and the City of London School. He was a student of Lincoln's Inn, and when war was declared was reading for his final examination. He joined the Inns of Court O.T.C. in November, 1914, and in January, 1915, received a commission in the Essex Regiment. He went to the front in September, 1916, being attached to the Oxford. and Bucks. L.I.

Second Lieutenant Alfred Lewis Arnold.

Second Lieutenant ALFRED LEWIS ARNOLD, London Regiment (The Queen's), killed in action on 15th August, aged twenty-eight, was the younger son of Mr. John A. Arnold, of Blackpool. He was educated at Arnold House School, South Shore, Blackpool, and at Brussels and Kiel. He subsequently studied law in London and passed the solicitors' final examination with honours in his twenty-first year. He was admitted on the rolls, but before he practised he went to America, where he stayed some two years to get experience in business. On his return to London he joined the staff of his uncle's firm, now Messrs. Hicks, Arnold, & Bender, of which firm he was a junior partner at his death. He was married to the younger daughter of Mr. John Hess, of "Elsinore," Dartmouth-road, Willesden Green, whom he leaves a widow with two baby boys. He was killed instantaneously by a shell, and at the time he fell he was commanding a company in the 1st Bn. Queen Victoria Rifles, to which regiment he was attached. His colonel writes: "He had proved himself to be a most capable and brave officer, and his death is a very great loss to me. Had he lived there is no doubt that his promotion would have been rapid. I feel his death very keenly, he had such a splendid character."

Legal News.

General.

Three residents of Peasedown St. John, near Bath, were convicted at Weston Petty Sessions on Saturday for offences under the Sugar Order. William Hamilton was fined £5; Alfred Thomas Woodham £2, and his wife £1. Hamilton's defence was that he acted for seventeen other persons and divided the sugar. In the case of Mrs. Woodham, the defence was that she received the sugar from her daughter, and the Court was satisfied that she did not sign the application form. She was, however, convicted for using sugar contrary to the purpose for which it was issued. Her husband applied for 10 lb. of sugar for soft fruit and 30 lb. for stone fruit, but received by mistake 30 lb. for soft fruit. The Chairman intimated that any future cases would be more severely dealt with.

What was described by the Enfield Bench as a "very improper act" on the part of a local munition factory was referred to in a case heard at Enfield on Tuesday, in which a munition worker named Peak was charged with being an absentee from the Army since 2nd March. A detective stated that the man voluntarily enlisted at the end of February, and was posted to the Royal West Surrey Regiment. He obtained leave to return to the factory to draw his back pay, and, when there, was asked if he would stay. His railway warrant to return to the depôt was taken from him and a protection pass given to him. The Chairman said that it was a very serious case, and that a report would be forwarded to the Army authorities. The defendant was remanded to await an escort.

At Westminster Police Court on Saturday, before Mr. Rooth, Elizabeth Milton, fifty-three, pleaded "Guilty" to shop-lifting at the Army and Navy Stores. Detective-Sergeant Wood stated that the prisoner was identified by finger-prints as having been twenty-one times convicted for larceny and other offences. The magistrate said that when he was counsel in a charge of murder years ago at the Central Criminal Court evidence for the prosecution relied on finger-prints taken from a cashbox. Mr. Justice Channell, who tried the case, said he could not be satisfied with the evidence of finger-prints alone; there must be corroboration. Mr. Rooth added that he would hold to that ruling in that Court. Sergeant Wood said the prisoner had admitted the convictions to him. Mr. Rooth: I want better proof. Please bring someone to identify the woman and prove her history. The prisoner was then remanded.

Seven dairy farmers were summoned at West Bromwich on Tuesday for selling milk, wholesale, at higher prices than that fixed by the Food Controller. In each case the milk was sold at from 2½d. to 4d. a gallon more than the fixed price. In one case the overcharge on the milk sold in five weeks amounted to £29 7s. 4d. For the defence it was stated that, owing to the increased cost of foodstuffs, farmers were unable to sell milk at the price fixed by the Food Controller without incurring loss. Unless they were allowed to charge more they would have to give up farming and sell their cattle, which would mean a dearth of milk during the coming winter. It was stated that in March an amending Order was promised fixing the price at not less than 1s. 7d. a gallon, but this had not yet been issued. A fine of £5 in each case was imposed, the stipendiary remarking that the price of feeding stuffs as well as of milk should be fixed.

At Clerkenwell Police Court on Tuesday, before Mr. Bros, Bruno Max Emil Sherwood, of Verulam-street, Gray's Inn-road, was summoned for sending to Sydney Tubbs at Basinghall-street a letter in which his (Sherwood's) former surname and nationality of origin, not being British, were not mentioned in legible characters. He pleaded guilty. Mr. Ginsburg, prosecuting for the Board of Trade, said the defendant wrote to Mr. Tubbs, who was administering the affairs of Schultz & Co., optical instrument makers. He had acted as secretary to the company, but the notepaper did not disclose the fact that his former name was "Schultz," and that he was a German. Mr. Purchase, counsel for the defendant, said it was a technical offence, and no one was deceived. Mr. Tubbs as an official knew all about Mr. Sherwood, who had been in this country fifteen years and was naturalized long ago. The defendant had had proper stationery prepared, and this was a regrettable slip. Mr. Bros ordered the defendant to pay a fine of £5 and £5 5s. costs.

Reference was made on Tuesday morning, at the opening of the House of Commons Appeals Tribunal, to the inclusion of Mr. Donald Maclean, the chairman, among the Knights Commanders of the Order of the British Empire, and to the growing popularity of the tribunals. Mr. Bettesworth Piggott, who presided, said that Sir Donald Maclean was taking a well-earned holiday, but he would like to offer congratulations, on behalf of himself and his colleagues, on the honour which the King had conferred upon him. It was largely due to Sir Donald Maclean's efforts that the initial stages, and the organization and administration of the tribunal were due. There had been an enormous amount of work. The cases had become more difficult, and their duties had become more unpleasant and distasteful to them in realizing the great hardships that often occurred to those who appeared before them. But he gathered from what he heard—and he thought it was true—that the tribunal was not only meeting with the approval of the public, but that it had gained its confidence and respect. This was very largely due to the example of Sir Donald Maclean.

Winding-up Notices.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Aug. 17.

JAMES ALLAN, LTD.—(IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION.) Creditors are required, on or before Aug 31, to send in their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to William Owen, Allan's Yard, Woodville rd, East, Cardiff, liquidator.

RENE, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Reginald John Wickham Hurd, LL.D., 55, Fore st, liquidator.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Aug. 21.

CHESTER & NORTH WALES MOTOR & GARAGE CO, LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 29, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Edward Noel Humphreys, Old Bank Bldgs, Eastgate, Chester, liquidator.

A. A. EXCLUSIVES, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Arnold Wood, Whitehall chmbrs, Colmore row, Birmingham, liquidator.

Resolutions for Winding-up Voluntarily.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Aug. 17.

Zongo Rubber Estate, Ltd.
Herne Hill Cinema, Ltd.
Moorgate Syndicate, Ltd.
Golf Club Proprietaries, Ltd.
James Allan, Ltd.
Rubens Photogravure Co, Ltd.
Ship "Endora" Co, Ltd.

London Gazette—TUESDAY, Aug 21.

Alberta Land Co, Ltd.
Excelda Glazing Co, Ltd.
Folkestone Football and Sports Club, Ltd
"Roath" Steamship Co, Ltd.
Foreign and Colonial Oil and Rubber, Ltd.
La Sirena Gold Mining Co, Ltd.
Anglo-Mexican and Brazilian Options Ltd.
Empresa Espanolas Ltd.
New Trinidad Oil Co. Ltd.
E. B. Wood & Co, Ltd.
Incorporated National Association of British and Irish Millers.
Oriental Newspaper Co, Ltd.
Wing Steamship Co, Ltd.
Keswick (Derwentwater) Steam Launch Co, Ltd.

Winding-up of Enemy Businesses.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Aug. 21.

CHARLES KROFT.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept 29, to send by prepaid post full particulars of their debts or claims, to William Nicholson, 12, Wood st, Controller.

LIEBLICH NANSEN AND CO, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept 30, to send in their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Sir John George Cragg, 3, London Wall bldgs, Controller.

HENRY POSAMENT.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept 21, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts and claims, to Walter Boyle, 122 York rd, Westminster Bridge rd, Controller.

Creditors' Notices.

Under Estates in Chancery.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, August 17.

EWART, CHARLES THEODORE, Claybury, Woodford Bridge, Essex Oct 9 Woodroffes and Another v. Ewart, Astbury J. Ogilvie, Essex-st, Strand

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, August 28.

COALBANK, ISAAC, Teddington Medical Practitioner Oct 12 Witt v. Coalbank, Sargant J. Phillips, King's Bench-walk

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Aug. 24.

ADSHEAD, ELIZABETH GRIFFITH, Belper, Derby Oct 3 Walker & Terry, Belper
ALLEN, JOHN HIGGINS, Cambridge, Barrister at Law Sept 24 Church & Co, Lincoln's inn fields
ALLKINS, HELEN MATILDA, Seabright st, Bethnal Green Sept 30 Simpson, Essex st
ASHTON, WINIFRED LUCY, St Giles, nr Salisbury Sept 29 Witham & Co, Gray's inn sq
BARROW, THOMAS, Silverdale, Staffs, Engine Driver Sept 24 Till, Newcastle, Staffs
BATTERS, FRANK GILDEROY, Christchurch, New Zealand Sept 24 Adams & Adams, Clement's inn
BOFFEY, WILFRED MAJOR, Buxton, Hotel Manager Sept 30 Hall, Folkestone
BRAND, THOMAS RICHARD WILLS, Redland, Bristol Sept 25 A G & N G Heaven, Bristol
BRAY, LUCY, Marhamchurch, Cornwall Oct 10 Peter & Peter, Holsworthy, Devon
BROWN, WALTER HORNER, Adelaide rd, South Hampstead, Merchant Sept 29 Coburn & Co, St Helens pl
CARVILL, JOHN, Bridlington, Yorks, General Dealer Sept 22 Richardson & Co, Bridlington
CLAYTON, ROBERT, Bishton, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturer Nov 1 Sardeman, Accrington
COMYNS, AMELIA KATE, Ladbroke gr, Notting Hill Sept 10 Rye & Eyre, Golden sq